THE HON'BLE Dr. JUSTICE G. YETHIRAJULU

W.P.M.P.No.25758 of 2004
in
W.P. No.15621 of 2004

FRIDAY, THE FOURTEENTH DAY OF JULY
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

Between:

L.L.R. Elementary School,
Represented by its Correspondent,
Rentachintala, Guntur District,
P.V. Veeraswamy. … **Petitioner**

and

G. Venkata Reddy, s/o. Rami Reddy,
R/o. Rentachintala, Guntur District,
and 2 others
… **Respondents**

THE HON'BLE Dr. JUSTICE G. YETHIRAJULU

W.P.M.P.No.25758 of 2004
in
W.P. No.15621 of 2004

ORDER:

This review petition is filed by the third respondent in the writ petition praying to recall the order dated 02-09-2004 in W.P.No.15621 of 2004 and dismiss the writ petition.

2) This Court passed an order directing the third respondent to furnish all the service particulars and the salary particulars of the petitioner to the Mandal Educational Officer, Rentachintala, after releasing whatever increments due to the petitioner, within ten days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

3. The petitioner in the review petition submits that on 28-07-2004 he addressed a letter to the petitioner informing that he was

imposed a punishment of stoppage of one increment without cumulative effect and the petitioner willfully suppressed the said fact and filed the writ petition praying to release the increment. The petitioner did not prefer any appeal to the competent authority under the provisions of Andhra Pradesh Educational Act against the order of imposing punishment of stoppage of one increment without cumulative effect dated 28-07-2004 and the order became final. He further submits that the increment due for February 2003 was already released and all the papers were sent to the respondents 1 and 2 as directed by this Court. In view of the above fact, the increment said to be due to the petitioner in February 2004 could not be released on account of the order of punishment dated 11-06-2004, but the increment for February 2003 was released and all the connected proposals were sent to the first respondent.

4) This Court only directed to send the service records and the connected papers after releasing the increments due to petitioner at the instance of third respondent. If there is any order already passed by the third respondent according to law, and if any amount is already released towards increment due in February 2003, he may mention all those facts and furnish the details of those enquiry proceedings and the increment release order etc. If it is a fact that the petitioner was imposed the punishment of stoppage of one increment without cumulative effect and the release of increment due in February 2003, on communicating of those proceedings, it shall be deemed that it is sufficient compliance of the order of this Court and if the petitioner is aggrieved by such communication, he is at liberty to seek the appropriate remedy before the authorities concerned according to law.

5) With the above clarification, the review petition is disposed of. No order as to costs.

Dr. G. YETHIRAJULU, J

Date: 14--07—2006
lsn